

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 7 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 7 can be found, at least, at paragraphs [0093]-[0105]. Thus, no new matter is added.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0052796 (Tadokoro) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,088 (Takeda); and rejects claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tadokoro in view of Takeda further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,851,115 (Cheyer). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The applied references fail to disclose or render obvious "the user information is updated when at least one of the plural services is selected to constitute the job flow without execution of the at least one selected services before the finish of the job flow," as recited by independent claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that Tadokoro in combination with Takeda discloses the above-quoted feature. In particular, the Office Action alleges that Tadokoro discloses at paragraph [0069] and in Fig. 8 that various states are recorded whenever a user uses a service. Thus, Tadokoro discloses that a state code 804 stores such dates as login and logout, or starting and ending. However, Tadokoro fails to disclose the above feature because Tadokoro merely discloses recording various states when various services are executed, such as starting and ending of processes. Tadokoro differs from the above recitation of independent claim 1 because Tadokoro fails to disclose that information is updated with each selection before execution of each function constituting a job flow, and only discloses recording states after execution has begun. Thus, Tadokoro fails to disclose the above feature of independent claim 1. The remaining references fail to at least cure the above deficiency of Tadokoro.

Further, Tadokoro fails to disclose the above feature because Tadokoro does not disclose updating of user information. Tadokoro discloses at paragraph [0068] and in Fig. 5 updating an entry when information of services are used and is silent towards updating any user information. Further, in Fig. 8 of Tadokoro, state code 804 is recorded to a table 134, which constitutes a state record and thus does not involve a service selection attributed to individual users. Thus, Tadokoro fails to disclose the above feature. The remaining references fail to disclose the above feature.

The applied references fail to disclose or render obvious "values of the user information are checked against values of the restriction value table," as recited by independent claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that Tadokoro discloses the above-quoted feature with table 132 of Fig. 6 and table 134 of Fig. 8. However, Tadokoro fails to disclose checking anything against the values contained in those tables. Instead, the values are merely used as references for storing information available for services accessible or allowable for use by the user. Thus, because Tadokoro discloses that tables 132 and 134 are merely records of available services, Tadokoro fails to disclose that user information is checked against values in the restriction value table. The remaining references fail to at least cure the above deficiency of Tadokoro.

For similar reasons as above, the applied references fail to disclose or render obvious "values of the user information are checked against values of the respective restriction value tables," and "the user information is updated when at least one of the plural services is selected to constitute the job flow without execution of the at least one selected services before the finish of the job flow," as recited by independent claim 7.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 7 are patentable over the applied references.

Claims 4, 6, 8 and 10 are patentable at least for their various dependencies from the independent claims as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Lauren C. Schleh
Registration No. 65,457

JAO:VVR/crh

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: February 2, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</p> <p>Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
